

# InterOffice Memo

Department of Workforce Development

*Date:* March 6, 2003

*To:* Interested Parties

*From:* Mary C. Rowin, Deputy Administrator  
Division of Workforce Solutions



*Subject:* **Attached Report "Analysis of W-2 Sanctions by Race 2001 and 2002"**

The attached report, entitled "Analysis of W-2 Sanctions by Race 2001 and 2002," represents the results of an initial exploratory analysis of the prevalence of sanctions by race in the W-2 program.

Recent research suggests that some racial groups may be sanctioned at a higher rate than others in the W-2 program. This is a very complex issue and will require additional research beyond the exploratory analysis presented here. However, based on this review, the Division of Workforce Solutions has determined that the issue warrants further study in order to identify potential problems with more precision.

Using available data, the DWS analysis was able to draw some conclusions that will guide further research and, where appropriate, help the Division to develop corrective action. Our findings are as follows:

- there are differences in the overall sanction rate by agency
- there are differences in the rate of sanction for whites and non-whites in a few agencies
- there are differences in the rate of sanctions for persons placed in Community Service Jobs and those in W-2 Transitional placements

Based on these findings, the Department is taking the following actions:

- We will meet with agencies that appear to be sanctioning at higher than expected rates to review the data that describes their sanctioning practices. Where necessary, we will work with those agencies to develop corrective action plans.
- We will review the W-2 sanction policies in light of these findings and, where necessary, modify or clarify those policies.
- We will begin monitoring all W-2 agencies to ensure that they are correctly and consistently applying sanction policies.
- We will implement the new Barriers Screening tool, which will enable agencies to make more appropriate placement decisions and assigned activities for W-2 participants.
- We will conduct a follow-up evaluation of the Barriers Screen tool to determine its impact, after a sufficient implementation period.

In addition, we will continue to look at the most recent data (as it becomes available) to explore the complexities of the relationship between policy, race and sanction rates. The Department is committed to forthrightly addressing issues that may arise from this research.

## Analysis of W-2 Sanctions by Race 2001 and 2002

### Background

- **DWS conducted an analysis of sanctions by race among 2001 and 2002 W-2 participants.** The analysis was framed to address the question: “What is the probability of sanctioning for an individual from a specific racial/ethnic group?”
- **The findings presented here reflect 2001 and 2002 data.**
- **The analysis looked at sanction outcomes by race** for each of the two major types of placements (Community Service Jobs and W-2 Transitional placements), for Milwaukee County and the balance of the state, for each Milwaukee County agency and for each balance-of-state agency with a substantial number of black participants. Cases not eligible for sanction were removed from the analysis.
- **An apparent disparity in sanction rates does not necessarily indicate that racial bias exists.** The appearance of differences in outcome by race may be explained by legitimate differences and variations in population and program characteristics. It is necessary to conduct further case-specific investigations to determine the likely causes of the apparent differences in sanction rates by race that are noted in this report.

### Statewide Findings

- **The difference in sanction rates by race pertain to both CSJ and W-2 T placements.** In 2002, sanction rates for CSJ placements were as follows: whites 52 percent, blacks 55 percent and Hispanics 59 percent. For W-2 T placements in 2002, 23 percent of whites, 28 percent of blacks and 34 percent of Hispanics were sanctioned.
- **Much of the statewide difference in sanction rates for whites and non-whites may be attributed to the occurrence of three factors.** CSJ placements are sanctioned at a higher rate than other placements, CSJ placements are used at a higher rate in Milwaukee County and Milwaukee County has most of the non-white participants.

### Milwaukee Findings

- **Sanction rates for CSJ placements varied greatly among Milwaukee agencies.** In 2002, CSJ sanction rates ranged from a low of 35 percent for UMOS-5605 to a high of 61 percent for YW-Works-5601. Much of this difference may be explained by low levels of case activity at the former Employment Solutions agencies.
- **Sanction rates for W-2 T placements also varied greatly among Milwaukee agencies.** In 2002, W-2 T sanction rates range from a low of 15 percent for UMOS-5605 to a high of 39 percent for MAXIMUS. Again, much of this difference may be explained by low levels of case activity at the former Employment Solutions agencies.
- **Sanction rates for CSJ and W-2 T placements varied among Milwaukee agencies between 2001 and 2002.** In 2002, sanction rates for CSJ placements increased in three of the six Milwaukee County agencies. Sanction rates for W-2 T participants increased in three and went down in two of the six agencies.
- **Comparisons of sanction rates by race were indeterminate in four of the six Milwaukee County agencies because of the small number of white participants.** In four agencies, 85 percent or more of the participants for whom race was identified were black.

- **Some concerns raised by the 2001 data were lessened in analysis of the 2002 data.** In 2001, UMOS-5602 appeared to have sanctioned Hispanics in CSJs at a higher rate than other groups, but this difference disappeared in 2002. An apparent sanctioning disparity by race at MAXIMUS-5606 in 2001 all but disappeared in 2002.

### Balance of State Findings

- **Four county agencies (Dane, Kenosha, Racine and Rock) sanctioned CSJ placements at a higher rate than the remaining balance-of-state agencies.** The sanction rate for CSJ placements ranged from 59 percent in Rock County to 66 percent in Dane County in 2002. This compares to 56 percent for all agencies in the balance of the state.
- **The sanction rate for W-2 T placements varied among these four agencies.** The sanction rate for W-2 T placements ranged from a low of 15 percent in Dane County to a high of 35 percent in Racine County in 2002. This compares to 21 percent for all agencies in the balance of the state.
- **Relatively few Hispanics were served by these four agencies.** In Dane and Rock Counties, for example Hispanics comprise less than 5 percent of the CSJ and W-2 T populations. Their relatively small numbers preclude a comparative analysis.
- **A disparity in sanction rates by race was apparent in Dane County.** For CSJ placements in Dane County in 2002, 55 percent of whites and 70 percent of blacks were sanctioned. These rates were very similar to 2001. Among W-2 T placements, 11 percent of whites and 30 percent of blacks were sanctioned in 2001. This disparity was reduced considerably in 2002 (13 and 17 percent of whites and blacks were sanctioned, respectively).
- **A disparity in sanction rates by race was apparent in Racine County for 2002, but not 2001.** For CSJ placements in Racine County in 2002, 43 percent of whites and 70 percent of blacks were sanctioned. Among W-2 T placements, 24 percent of whites and 39 percent of blacks were sanctioned in 2002. This disparity was not apparent in 2001.
- **A disparity in sanction rates by race was apparent in Rock County.** For CSJ placements in Rock County in 2002, 49 percent of whites and 75 percent of blacks were sanctioned. Among W-2 T placements, 14 percent of whites and 27 percent of blacks were sanctioned in 2002. The disparity for CSJ sanctions increased in 2002 while the disparity among W-2 T placements was roughly the same for both years.
- **A disparity in sanction rates by race was apparent in Kenosha County.** For CSJ placements in Kenosha County in 2002, 54 percent of whites and 66 percent of blacks were sanctioned. Among W-2 T placements, 24 percent of whites and 33 percent of blacks were sanctioned in 2002. This disparity appears to have grown somewhat from 2001.

### Next Steps

- **The Department is committed to identifying the causes of apparent disparities and, where appropriate, taking corrective action.** DWS staff is continuing to analyze data and will meet with agencies to review findings, review sanction policies in light of findings, and to monitor agencies to ensure that policies are being administered correctly and uniformly. In addition, the Department is proceeding to implement a new Barriers Screening tool, which should help agencies make more appropriate placements. A follow-up evaluation will be conducted to determine the impact of the tool.

# Sanctioned CSJ Participants as a Percent of Total CSJ Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level

## CSJ PARTICIPANTS

Statewide (2001)	A	B	C
	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
Ethnicity			
American Indian/Eskimo	100	49	49.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	94	33	35.1%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	6574	3677	55.9%
Hispanic Origin	973	538	55.3%
Southeast Asian	13	1	7.7%
White	1620	760	46.9%
Other	28	10	35.7%
Unknown	1555	863	55.5%
Total	10957	5931	54.1%

Milwaukee County (2001)	A	B	C
	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
Ethnicity			
American Indian/Eskimo	67	39	58.2%
Asian or Pacific Islander	63	23	36.5%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	6045	3313	54.8%
Hispanic Origin	886	485	54.7%
Southeast Asian	6	0	0.0%
White	858	394	45.9%
Other	19	7	36.8%
Unknown	1362	752	55.2%
Total	9306	5013	53.9%

YW-Works-5601 (2001)	A	B	C
	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
Ethnicity			
American Indian/Eskimo	3	1	33.3%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2	1	50.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	778	494	63.5%
Hispanic Origin	68	46	67.6%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	54	32	59.3%
Other	0	0	0.0%
Unknown	154	103	66.9%
Total	1059	677	63.9%

UMOS-5602 (2001)	A	B	C
	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
Ethnicity			
American Indian/Eskimo	28	13	46.4%
Asian or Pacific Islander	10	5	50.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	282	134	47.5%
Hispanic Origin	621	330	53.1%
Southeast Asian	2	0	0.0%
White	372	158	42.5%
Other	8	2	25.0%
Unknown	234	131	56.0%
Total	1557	773	49.6%

# Sanctioned CSJ Participants as a Percent of Total CSJ Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level

## CSJ PARTICIPANTS

OIC-5603 (2001)	A	B	C
	CSJ	CSJ	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	3	2	66.7%
Asian or Pacific Islander	5	1	20.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	1649	932	56.5%
Hispanic Origin	20	13	65.0%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	46	23	50.0%
Other	5	3	60.0%
Unknown	284	148	52.1%
Total	2012	1122	55.8%

Employment Solutions, Inc.-5604 (2001)	A	B	C
	CSJ	CSJ	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	4	2	50.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	4	2	50.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	1493	701	47.0%
Hispanic Origin	11	4	36.4%
Southeast Asian	1	0	0.0%
White	31	11	35.5%
Other	1	0	0.0%
Unknown	304	150	49.3%
Total	1849	870	47.1%

Employment Solutions, Inc.-5605 (2001)	A	B	C
	CSJ	CSJ	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	2	1	50.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	9	0	0.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	1619	669	41.3%
Hispanic Origin	19	9	47.4%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	92	30	32.6%
Other	2	0	0.0%
Unknown	241	104	43.2%
Total	1984	813	41.0%

MAXIMUS-5606 (2001)	A	B	C
	CSJ	CSJ	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	34	23	67.6%
Asian or Pacific Islander	33	14	42.4%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	1025	594	58.0%
Hispanic Origin	198	98	49.5%
Southeast Asian	3	0	0.0%
White	310	153	49.4%
Other	5	3	60.0%
Unknown	332	163	49.1%
Total	1940	1048	54.0%

# Sanctioned CSJ Participants as a Percent of Total CSJ Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level

## CSJ PARTICIPANTS

Balance of State (2001)	A	B	C
Ethnicity	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	33	10	30.3%
Asian or Pacific Islander	31	10	32.3%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	547	368	67.3%
Hispanic Origin	91	53	58.2%
Southeast Asian	7	1	14.3%
White	772	368	47.7%
Other	9	3	33.3%
Unknown	196	112	57.1%
Total	1686	925	54.9%

Dane County (2001)	A	B	C
Ethnicity	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	3	3	100.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	8	4	50.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	298	209	70.1%
Hispanic Origin	26	19	73.1%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	115	64	55.7%
Other	2	0	0.0%
Unknown	48	30	62.5%
Total	500	329	65.8%

# Sanctioned CSJ Participants as a Percent of Total CSJ Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level

## CSJ PARTICIPANTS

Kenosha County (2001)	A	B	C
	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
Ethnicity			
American Indian/Eskimo	0	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	0	0.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	100	69	69.0%
Hispanic Origin	34	22	64.7%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	88	53	60.2%
Other	1	1	100.0%
Unknown	37	31	83.8%
Total	261	176	67.4%

Racine County (2001)	A	B	C
	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
Ethnicity			
American Indian/Eskimo	0	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	0	0.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	51	33	64.7%
Hispanic Origin	8	4	50.0%
Southeast Asian	1	0	0.0%
White	16	10	62.5%
Other	0	0	0.0%
Unknown	12	6	50.0%
Total	89	53	59.6%

Rock County (2001)	A	B	C
	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
Ethnicity			
American Indian/Eskimo	2	2	100.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	62	39	62.9%
Hispanic Origin	3	0	0.0%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	110	64	58.2%
Other	0	0	0.0%
Unknown	33	15	45.5%
Total	210	120	57.1%

# Sanctioned W-2 T Participants as a Percent of Total W-2 T Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level

## W-2 T Participants

Statewide (2001)	A	B	C
	W2T	W2T	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	110	26	23.6%
Asian or Pacific Islander	97	25	25.8%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	3649	1072	29.4%
Hispanic Origin	546	182	33.3%
Southeast Asian	14	3	21.4%
White	2027	414	20.4%
Other	19	6	31.6%
Unknown	773	187	24.2%
Total	7235	1915	26.5%

Milwaukee County (2001)	A	B	C
	W2T	W2T	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	55	14	25.5%
Asian or Pacific Islander	62	17	27.4%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	3270	968	29.6%
Hispanic Origin	480	164	34.2%
Southeast Asian	7	2	28.6%
White	646	171	26.5%
Other	15	5	33.3%
Unknown	579	152	26.3%
Total	5114	1493	29.2%

YW-Works-5601 (2001)	A	B	C
	W2T	W2T	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	3	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2	0	0.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	549	253	46.1%
Hispanic Origin	48	19	39.6%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	50	20	40.0%
Other	1	1	100.0%
Unknown	90	30	33.3%
Total	743	323	43.5%

UMOS-5602 (2001)	A	B	C
	W2T	W2T	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	20	4	20.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	8	1	12.5%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	139	44	31.7%
Hispanic Origin	288	94	32.6%
Southeast Asian	1	0	0.0%
White	233	68	29.2%
Other	7	1	14.3%
Unknown	77	19	24.7%
Total	773	231	29.9%

# Sanctioned W-2 T Participants as a Percent of Total W-2 T Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level

## W-2 T Participants

OIC-5603 (2001)	A	B	C
	W2T	W2T	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	2	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2	1	50.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	821	229	27.9%
Hispanic Origin	6	3	50.0%
Southeast Asian	1	0	0.0%
White	29	6	20.7%
Other	3	1	33.3%
Unknown	98	31	31.6%
Total	962	271	28.2%

Employment Solutions, Inc.-5604 (2001)	A	B	C
	W2T	W2T	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	1	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	3	0	0.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	761	135	17.7%
Hispanic Origin	15	1	6.7%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	16	1	6.3%
Other	2	0	0.0%
Unknown	108	17	15.7%
Total	906	154	17.0%

Employment Solutions, Inc.-5605 (2001)	A	B	C
	W2T	W2T	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	4	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	6	1	16.7%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	765	108	14.1%
Hispanic Origin	14	3	21.4%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	65	6	9.2%
Other	0	0	0.0%
Unknown	94	12	12.8%
Total	948	130	13.7%

MAXIMUS-5606 (2001)	A	B	C
	W2T	W2T	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	28	10	35.7%
Asian or Pacific Islander	41	14	34.1%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	632	234	37.0%
Hispanic Origin	139	46	33.1%
Southeast Asian	5	2	40.0%
White	289	74	25.6%
Other	4	2	50.0%
Unknown	166	46	27.7%
Total	1304	428	32.8%

# Sanctioned W-2 T Participants as a Percent of Total W-2 T Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level

## W-2 T Participants

Balance of State (2001)	A	B	C
Ethnicity	W2T Participants	W2T Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	55	12	21.8%
Asian or Pacific Islander	35	8	22.9%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	391	105	26.9%
Hispanic Origin	72	18	25.0%
Southeast Asian	7	1	14.3%
White	1392	244	17.5%
Other	4	1	25.0%
Unknown	195	35	17.9%
Total	2151	424	19.7%

Dane County (2001)	A	B	C
Ethnicity	W2T Participants	W2T Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	1	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	9	3	33.3%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	173	52	30.1%
Hispanic Origin	14	2	14.3%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	170	19	11.2%
Other	2	0	0.0%
Unknown	34	3	8.8%
Total	403	79	19.6%

**Sanctioned W-2 T Participants as a Percent of Total W-2 T Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level**

**W-2 T Participants**

<b>Kenosha County (2001)</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
Ethnicity	W2T Participants	W2T Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	0	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	67	16	23.9%
Hispanic Origin	15	2	13.3%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	131	24	18.3%
Other	1	1	100.0%
Unknown	20	6	30.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>20.9%</b>

<b>Racine County (2001)</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
Ethnicity	W2T Participants	W2T Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	0	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	58	14	24.1%
Hispanic Origin	6	3	50.0%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	42	10	23.8%
Other	0	0	0.0%
Unknown	12	3	25.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>25.4%</b>

<b>Rock County (2001)</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
Ethnicity	W2T Participants	W2T Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	1	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	47	11	23.4%
Hispanic Origin	3	1	33.3%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	106	10	9.4%
Other	0	0	0.0%
Unknown	26	5	19.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>14.8%</b>

**Sanctioned CSJ Participants as a Percent of Total CSJ Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level (2002)**

**CSJ PARTICIPANTS**

Statewide (2002)	A	B	C
Ethnicity	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	113	76	67.3%
Asian or Pacific Islander	113	48	42.5%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	7973	4389	55.0%
Hispanic Origin	1119	664	59.3%
Southeast Asian	12	5	41.7%
White	1972	1031	52.3%
Other	27	10	37.0%
Unknown	1983	1093	55.1%
Unduplicated Wisc. Total	13273	7308	55.1%

Milwaukee County (2002)	A	B	C
Ethnicity	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	83	58	69.9%
Asian or Pacific Islander	89	35	39.3%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	7402	3997	54.0%
Hispanic Origin	1033	612	59.2%
Southeast Asian	5	4	80.0%
White	1114	612	54.9%
Other	22	9	40.9%
Unknown	1781	972	54.6%
Unduplicated Total	11495	6294	54.8%

YW-Works-5601 (2002)	A	B	C
Ethnicity	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	3	3	100.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	840	512	61.0%
Hispanic Origin	72	44	61.1%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	50	22	44.0%
Other	1	0	0.0%
Unknown	189	120	63.5%
Unduplicated Total	1155	701	60.7%

UMOS-5602 (2002)	A	B	C
Ethnicity	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	35	22	62.9%
Asian or Pacific Islander	13	8	61.5%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	267	159	59.6%
Hispanic Origin	703	415	59.0%
Southeast Asian	1	1	100.0%
White	455	270	59.3%
Other	5	2	40.0%
Unknown	237	124	52.3%
Unduplicated Total	1715	1000	58.3%

# Sanctioned CSJ Participants as a Percent of Total CSJ Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level (2002)

## CSJ PARTICIPANTS

OIC-5603 (2002)	A	B	C
	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
Ethnicity			
American Indian/Eskimo	5	2	40.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	11	3	27.3%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	2158	1207	55.9%
Hispanic Origin	26	12	46.2%
Southeast Asian	1	0	0.0%
White	66	36	54.5%
Other	5	1	20.0%
Unknown	418	226	54.1%
Unduplicated Total	2689	1487	55.3%

YW-Works-5604 (2002)	A	B	C
	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
Ethnicity			
American Indian/Eskimo	1	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	4	1	25.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	1750	874	49.9%
Hispanic Origin	20	8	40.0%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	36	14	38.9%
Other	2	2	100.0%
Unknown	389	191	49.1%
Unduplicated Total	2200	1089	49.5%

UMOS-5605 (2002)	A	B	C
	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
Ethnicity			
American Indian/Eskimo	4	2	50.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	15	3	20.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	2285	807	35.3%
Hispanic Origin	43	14	32.6%
Southeast Asian	1	1	100.0%
White	154	43	27.9%
Other	5	2	40.0%
Unknown	415	141	34.0%
Unduplicated Total	2915	1013	34.8%

MAXIMUS-5606 (2002)	A	B	C
	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
Ethnicity			
American Indian/Eskimo	43	31	72.1%
Asian or Pacific Islander	49	21	42.9%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	1132	681	60.2%
Hispanic Origin	236	136	57.6%
Southeast Asian	2	2	100.0%
White	428	247	57.7%
Other	7	3	42.9%
Unknown	406	229	56.4%
Unduplicated Total	2282	1347	59.0%

**Sanctioned CSJ Participants as a Percent of Total CSJ Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level  
(2002)**

**CSJ PARTICIPANTS**

Balance of State (2002)	A	B	C
Ethnicity	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	32	18	56.3%
Asian or Pacific Islander	24	13	54.2%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	596	394	66.1%
Hispanic Origin	90	52	57.8%
Southeast Asian	7	1	14.3%
White	884	427	48.3%
Other	5	1	20.0%
Unknown	213	122	57.3%
Unduplicated Total	1846	1025	55.5%

Dane County (2002)	A	B	C
Ethnicity	CSJ Participants	CSJ Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	2	2	100.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	6	4	66.7%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	324	226	69.8%
Hispanic Origin	25	16	64.0%
Southeast Asian	1	0	0.0%
White	141	78	55.3%
Other	1	0	0.0%
Unknown	56	38	67.9%
Unduplicated Total	556	364	65.5%

**Sanctioned CSJ Participants as a Percent of Total CSJ Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level  
(2002)**

**CSJ PARTICIPANTS**

<b>Kenosha County (2002)</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	CSJ	CSJ	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	0	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	1	100.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	119	78	65.5%
Hispanic Origin	32	20	62.5%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	82	44	53.7%
Other	0	0	0.0%
Unknown	36	22	61.1%
<b>Unduplicated Total</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>61.1%</b>

<b>Racine County (2002)</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	CSJ	CSJ	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	1	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	1	100.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	43	30	69.8%
Hispanic Origin	5	3	60.0%
Southeast Asian	1	0	0.0%
White	14	6	42.9%
Other	0	0	0.0%
Unknown	9	6	66.7%
<b>Unduplicated Total</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>62.2%</b>

<b>Rock County (2002)</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
	CSJ	CSJ	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	2	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	1	100.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	56	42	75.0%
Hispanic Origin	8	5	62.5%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	80	39	48.8%
Other	0	0	0.0%
Unknown	23	14	60.9%
<b>Unduplicated Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>59.0%</b>

**Sanctioned W-2 T Participants as a Percent of Total W-2 T Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level (2002)**

**W-2 T Participants**

Statewide (2002)	A	B	C
	W2T	W2T	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	105	37	35.2%
Asian or Pacific Islander	90	22	24.4%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	4124	1148	27.8%
Hispanic Origin	601	204	33.9%
Southeast Asian	17	4	23.5%
White	2129	479	22.5%
Other	16	2	12.5%
Unknown	842	212	25.2%
Unduplicated Wisc. Total	7910	2107	26.6%

Milwaukee County (2002)	A	B	C
	W2T	W2T	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	45	16	35.6%
Asian or Pacific Islander	49	16	32.7%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	3720	1049	28.2%
Hispanic Origin	508	179	35.2%
Southeast Asian	6	3	50.0%
White	669	191	28.6%
Other	13	2	15.4%
Unknown	625	168	26.9%
Unduplicated Total	5627	1624	28.9%

YW-Works-5601 (2002)	A	B	C
	W2T	W2T	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	4	1	25.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	0	0.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	572	193	33.7%
Hispanic Origin	48	20	41.7%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	49	8	16.3%
Other	1	0	0.0%
Unknown	98	25	25.5%
Unduplicated Total	773	247	32.0%

UMOS-5602 (2002)	A	B	C
	W2T	W2T	Percent
Ethnicity	Participants	Participants w/Sanctions	Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	14	5	35.7%
Asian or Pacific Islander	14	4	28.6%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	156	46	29.5%
Hispanic Origin	338	118	34.9%
Southeast Asian	1	1	100.0%
White	256	64	25.0%
Other	2	0	0.0%
Unknown	83	24	28.9%
Unduplicated Total	864	262	30.3%

# Sanctioned W-2 T Participants as a Percent of Total W-2 T Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level (2002)

## W-2 T Participants

OIC-5603 (2002)	A	B	C
	W2T Participants	W2T Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
Ethnicity			
American Indian/Eskimo	2	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	3	1	33.3%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	965	240	24.9%
Hispanic Origin	9	2	22.2%
Southeast Asian	1	0	0.0%
White	43	5	11.6%
Other	3	1	33.3%
Unknown	116	34	29.3%
Unduplicated Total	1142	283	24.8%

YW-Works-5604 (2002)	A	B	C
	W2T Participants	W2T Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
Ethnicity			
American Indian/Eskimo	0	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	3	0	0.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	894	197	22.0%
Hispanic Origin	9	0	0.0%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	29	3	10.3%
Other	3	0	0.0%
Unknown	132	28	21.2%
Unduplicated Total	1070	228	21.3%

UMOS-5605 (2002)	A	B	C
	W2T Participants	W2T Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
Ethnicity			
American Indian/Eskimo	3	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	7	1	14.3%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	1027	163	15.9%
Hispanic Origin	23	5	21.7%
Southeast Asian	1	0	0.0%
White	82	13	15.9%
Other	2	0	0.0%
Unknown	125	14	11.2%
Unduplicated Total	1269	196	15.4%

MAXIMUS-5606 (2002)	A	B	C
	W2T Participants	W2T Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
Ethnicity			
American Indian/Eskimo	26	10	38.5%
Asian or Pacific Islander	23	11	47.8%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	607	254	41.8%
Hispanic Origin	116	35	30.2%
Southeast Asian	4	2	50.0%
White	256	100	39.1%
Other	5	1	20.0%
Unknown	145	47	32.4%
Unduplicated Total	1176	460	39.1%

**Sanctioned W-2 T Participants as a Percent of Total W-2 T Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level (2002)**

**W-2 T Participants**

<b>Balance of State (2002)</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>W2T Participants</b>	<b>W2T Participants w/Sanctions</b>	<b>Percent Sanctioned (B/A)</b>
American Indian/Eskimo	62	22	35.5%
Asian or Pacific Islander	41	6	14.6%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	414	99	23.9%
Hispanic Origin	94	26	27.7%
Southeast Asian	11	1	9.1%
White	1467	289	19.7%
Other	3	0	0.0%
Unknown	219	44	20.1%
<b>Unduplicated Total</b>	<b>2305</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>21.1%</b>

<b>Dane County (2002)</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>W2T Participants</b>	<b>W2T Participants w/Sanctions</b>	<b>Percent Sanctioned (B/A)</b>
American Indian/Eskimo	2	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	14	3	21.4%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	184	31	16.8%
Hispanic Origin	15	3	20.0%
Southeast Asian	1	0	0.0%
White	170	22	12.9%
Other	0	0	0.0%
Unknown	28	2	7.1%
<b>Unduplicated Total</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>14.7%</b>

**Sanctioned W-2 T Participants as a Percent of Total W-2 T Participants, by Ethnicity and Geographic Level  
(2002)**

**W-2 T Participants**

<b>Kenosha County (2002)</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
Ethnicity	W2T Participants	W2T Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	1	1	100.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	58	19	32.8%
Hispanic Origin	19	4	21.1%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	118	28	23.7%
Other	0	0	0.0%
Unknown	23	4	17.4%
Unduplicated Total	219	56	25.6%

<b>Racine County (2002)</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
Ethnicity	W2T Participants	W2T Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	0	0	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	64	25	39.1%
Hispanic Origin	15	6	40.0%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	42	10	23.8%
Other	0	0	0.0%
Unknown	24	8	33.3%
Unduplicated Total	142	49	34.5%

<b>Rock County (2002)</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
Ethnicity	W2T Participants	W2T Participants w/Sanctions	Percent Sanctioned (B/A)
American Indian/Eskimo	2	1	50.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0%
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	55	15	27.3%
Hispanic Origin	2	0	0.0%
Southeast Asian	0	0	0.0%
White	111	15	13.5%
Other	0	0	0.0%
Unknown	22	3	13.6%
Unduplicated Total	192	34	17.7%